

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,751	07/31/2001		Wen-Yih Liao	LIAO3030/EM/7087	2784
23364	7590	07/20/2004		EXAMINER	
BACON &		•	ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J		
625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDI		22314	1756		

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			. \
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	5,
Advisory Action	09/917,751	LIAO ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Martin J Angebranndt	1756	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires eight months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the company of the company is calculated from the company of the company	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final O	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06 July 2004</u> . Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		า
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require furthe	·	see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelinNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): <u>The 112 rejections are w</u>	ithdrawn.	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT	place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: 30-49.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	. 1/	/
0.☑ Other: pto-892 citing applicant provided reference	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	11 Uhr	
		Martin/J Angebrannd Primary Examiner Art Init: 1756	It

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner ahs adderessed these issues previously, particularly pointing out the benefits of making the modifications suggesteed by the examiner and their basis in the prior art for record. Clearly, the TCNQ anion acts as a quencher/stabilier for cyanine dyes in general and is an improvement over acid anions. The advantages of 4-methoxycarbonylbenzyl moiety on the nitrogen of cyanine dyes is clearly taught by Liao et al. and as the dyes in the claimed mixtures are cyanine dyes, they would be expected to benefit from the use of TCNQ anions. With respect to the desirability of one of the dyes in the mixture having different N substitutents, this assymetry is clearly taught as desirable by Sato et al. for cyanijne dyes based optical recording media. Moreover, each of the exact benefits asserted by the applicants are already recognized in the one of the references applied. Therefore the benefits cannot be considered unobvious. The art rejections stand. The comparasions are not even with the closest prior art and only reasserts known advantages from the prior art applied.

= 1/2 fort